RESTORATION REVIEW

The Restoration Mind . . .

RESTORATION AND REVOLUTION

I have come to set fire to the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled! I have a baptism to undergo, and what constraint I am under until the ordeal is over! Do you suppose I came to establish peace on earth? No, indeed, I have come to bring division. —Lk. 12:49-50

Whatever else we may say of revolution it certainly conveys the idea of disturbance, fomentation, an unsettling. It implies radical change, upheaval, trouble. In using such terms as *fire* and *division* in describing his mission, Jesus identifies himself as a revolutionist.

He is indeed the Prince of Peace and the angels sang of "Peace on earth, goodwill toward men" at his birth. And it was only Jesus who could say "My peace I leave with you" and "Peace unto you." Yet in this passage and in Mt. 10:34 he displaces peace with fire and with the sword. *Fire, sword, division*—this is the language of a revolutionist. Jesus came to disturb the world, not to lull it to sleep with platitudes.

This can only mean that the peace that Jesus gives is but for those who love God and turn their back on a life of sin. The world itself is sinful and it will remain so. In calling the elect out of the world, thus making them the *ecclesia* (called out ones), he actually created division. Had Jesus not come the world would have gone on in its sin, undisturbed and untroubled. It is his cross that sets a son against his father and a father against his son, a mother against her daughter and a daughter against her mother. The cross is an offense to the world in that it points to the goodness of God and the sinfulness of man. The cross is divisive in that it sets those apart who respond to the love that God demonstrates through the sacrifice of the Christ.

God thus began a revolution when he sent Jesus to a world that did not want to change, for the very presence of the Christ demanded change. Jesus set this world aflame through the gospel that transforms the old man of sin into the new humanity. The point of the gospel is that it changes lives. Prostitutes quit being prostitutes because of Jesus. Thieves cease their thievery because of Jesus. Hateful, envious hearts are transformed into shrines of the Spirit because of Jesus. But every case of change is its own little revolution, for most of those around do not want the changes to occur. To stand up for Jesus often means to stand alone. It is the fire of

Volume 13, No. 4 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **April 1971**

The Restoration Mind . . .

RESTORATION AND REVOLUTION

I have come to set fire to the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled! I have a baptism to undergo, and what constraint I am under until the ordeal is over! Do you suppose I came to establish peace on earth? No, indeed, I have come to bring division. --- Lk. 12:49-50

Whatever else we may say of revolution it certainly conveys the idea of disturbance, fomentation, an unsettling. It implies radical change, upheaval, trouble. In using such terms as *fire* and *division* in describing his mission, Jesus identifies himself as a revolutionist.

He is indeed the Prince of Peace and the angels sang of "Peace on earth, goodwill toward men" at his birth. And it was only Jesus who could say "My peace I leave with you" and "Peace unto you." Yet in this passage and in Mt. 10:34 he displaces peace with fire and with the sword. *Fire, sword, division* --- this is the language of a revolutionist. Jesus came to disturb the world, not to lull it to sleep with platitudes.

This can only mean that the peace that Jesus gives is but for those who love God and turn their back on a life of sin. The world itself is sinful and it will remain so. In calling the elect out of the world, thus making them the *ecclesia* (called out ones), he actually created division. Had Jesus not come the world would have gone on in its sin, undisturbed and untroubled. It is his cross that sets a son against his father and a father against his son, a mother against her daughter and a daughter against her mother. The cross is an offense to the world in that it points to the goodness of God and the sinfulness of man. The cross is divisive in that it sets those apart who respond to the love that God demonstrates through the sacrifice of the Christ.

God thus began a revolution when he sent Jesus to a world that did not want to change, for the very presence of the Christ demanded change. Jesus set this world aflame through the gospel that transforms the old man of sin into the new humanity. The point of the gospel is that it changes lives. Prostitutes quit being prostitutes because of Jesus. Thieves cease their thievery because of Jesus. Hateful, envious hearts are transformed into shrines of the Spirit because of Jesus. But every case of change is its own little revolution, for most of those around do not want the changes to occur. To stand up for Jesus often means to stand alone. It is the fire of his love and his judgment that separates one man from another. The pathetic case of the slave girl in Acts 16 is to the point. She was possessed of an oracular spirit, which enabled her to tell fortunes, and was a means of great profit to her owners. When Paul drove the spirit from her, freeing her from her satanic bondage in the

name of Jesus, her owners turned on Paul with a vengeance. They did not want her free in Jesus, for this change in her denied them of their financial gain.

It was this kind of thing that caused the apostles to be dubbed "those who have turned the world upside down," or as the NEB renders it "men who have made trouble all over the world." Earlier in this journal we presented an essay on *Jesus Was Not a Nice Man.* One could just as well be presented on *Jesus Was a Trouble Maker.* And he made troublers out of his disciples. They cause trouble because they changed people's lives, something the world by its very nature abhors. This tears families apart and separates kith and kin.

Often a man has to rebel in order to serve, and so there is a relationship between revolution and service. Jesus was in trouble with the clergy of his time because of his insistence on serving the down and out. He came to minister to human needs and found the clergy in his way. The cry of Moses to Pharaoh was "Let my people go so that they can serve me." The clergy often impedes human progress, discourages benevolent ministries, and hampers spiritual growth in order to preserve orthodoxy. To break through the barriers erected by institutionalism one has to rebel. Almost without exception it is the case that, even in our own congregations, people are persecuted to the degree that they become free in Christ. To serve one must be free. To be free one must be a rebel. *Let my people go . . .* is the cry of revolution. And it is a principle of restoration, for restoration comes only through change and change only through revolution.

The prophets of Israel were revolutionists as well as reformers. They called for radical change, such as in Ezek. 21:26: "These are the words of the Lord God: Put off your diadem, lay aside your crown. All is changed; raise the low and bring down the high. Ruin! Ruin! I will bring about such ruin as never was before, until the rightful sovereign comes." Or as Isaiah sounds forth: "Cease to do evil and learn to do right, pursue justice and champion the oppressed; give the orphan his rights, plead the widow's cause" (Isa. 1 :17) . Prophets and apostles have always called for *newness.* It was not so much a changed social order that Amos and Jeremiah pled for, but a new covenant relationship between God and man. It is a qualitative change in man that God calls for, which is the point of becoming a new creation in Jesus Christ. This is the point of restoration: *man restored to God's likeness.*

This is the business of the Restoration Movement. We are rebels in that we want to be free. We want to be free so that we may serve. We want to serve so that we can be healers for God and restore fallen man. to his likeness. Our concern for such institutions as the Lord's Supper and baptism is mediate rather immediate, for these are but means to a larger end. We are not interested in getting people baptized the right way *per se,* but we are concerned about their relationship to God. And we know that baptism fits into the picture somehow as a *means.* This is even true of unity. It is a means, not an end itself. The end is

the salvation of the world and the glorification of God. But it is a necessary means in that nothing else will do, so we must realize it even if the price is revolution.

I share the view of the conservative Edmund Burke that while revolution is ethically defensible it is to be resorted to as the last resort. This means that we are not to be rebels just to be rebels. It may not be amiss to think of God's act in Jesus on the cross as the last resort. We rebel only when it is clear that it is the only way to bring about the necessary change.

It is the nature of revolutions that they are conducted by those in the minority. Fidel Castro had only 82 men, but he was heard to say that if he had it to do over he would have had but 10 or 12. The communist take-over in Russia was managed by a very small percentage of the populace. And our own American Revolution that gave birth to a new nation was staged by a handful of people against the most powerful country in the world.

This is even more dramatically true of those revolutions that are intended to set God's people free of oppression and tyranny. If revolution is "the larva of civilization," as Victor Hugo has said, how much more is it a principle of reform for God's people. And how much can be done by so few! We are witnessing this most gloriously in our own time, for we can see that just one dedicated person can make a big difference in a large congregation.

Those who are made uneasy by revolt and would prefer that we have no rebels around at all for the sake of peace would do well to study the words of Richard Whately: "The best security against revolution is in constant correction of abuses and the introduction of needed improvements. It is the neglect of timely repair that makes rebuilding necessary." It is our neglect of duty that has produced our rebels, so we should thank God for them, unless indeed we love neglect more than duty.

I realize that talk of revolution is not nice talk. We have to concede that Mao Tse-tung was right when he said: "Revolution is not a dinner party, nor an essay, nor a painting, nor a piece of embroidery." It is of the same stuff as surgery and war. Which of the prophets was not persecuted, which of the apostles was not harassed? Recently I joined a friend, a fellow rebel, for dinner with a Church of Christ elder who talked of better days, of change, of growth, of freedom. Afterwards I remarked to my friend: "He sincerely wants all these things, but he doesn't want to get his nose bloodied in getting them." Revolution is not a piece of embroidery, as Mao says, for it involves blood, guts, and tears. It means war.

I must emphasize in closing that in all this we are, of course, speaking of *peaceful* revolution. We join Paul in insisting that the weapons of our warfare can never be carnal, and this includes hate and strife as well as swords and bombs. All great revolutions, certainly spiritual ones, are the work of principles rather than of bayonets. Nor does this mean that the rebel is not to be one of patience and forbearance. He does nor call out the troops at the drop of the hat. He rather learns to stay and to put up with a lot. John Locke

saw this as a principle of revolution, which he saw as a gift of God to free men. He pointed out that man will bear "many wrong and inconvenient laws and all the slips of human frailty without mutiny or murmur," but in a long train of abuses and injustices the people rouse themselves to put the government into the hands of men who will secure the ends for which it was first erected.

Our folk have endured a great deal. Time is running out for the keepers of orthodoxy who insist on keeping our people in bondage. It is later than they think. *Let my people go!* is a cry resounding in our own time and throughout our ranks. We had all better get with it. And for those who need the encouragement of the future and the verdict of history, I leave with you the words of Ben Jonson on revolution.

Let them call it mischief; when it is past and prospered, it will be virtue. — the Editor

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

THE SPIRIT OF REVERENCE

Webster defines *reverence* as "an attitude of deep respect," and it is this quality of goodness that concerns me in this essay, for I am disturbed these days over the gross disrespect shown both men and institutions. It seems that we are reaping the consequence of not training our children to respect law and order, womanhood, truth, work, age, lessons of history, and all that makes civilization meaningful, not to mention God and his community on earth. I say we have failed in *training* our children in reverence, as distinguished from mere teaching, for in training a child we are showing him by our own life and example as well as by words.

Our words often get far ahead of our practice. A dear sister in the lord revealed to me recently, with tear-dimmed eyes, that her son had married a Negro. "We tried to talk him out of it, but he wouldn't listen," she said pathetically. She told of how she and her husband, both dedicated disciples of Jesus, had taught their children not to be prejudiced. Now that one of them has married a black person, she wonders if she overdid it. The truth is that most of us teach truths about justice and equality that we have not put into practice in our own private lives. "We must not be prejudiced," we tell our family, then offer our protests at the thought of minorities moving into our community. "I wouldn't want my daughter to marry one," is a common judgment of un-prejudiced people.

It does not occur to us that this is one of the grossest forms of disrespect, to draw the line on a person because of the color of his skin, regardless of the reason. My reply to the sister who faces the prospect of having a *black* grandchild (horrors!) was this: "Accept that black girl with open arms and love her to death for Jesus' sake. Think of how she feels, isolated and rejected. This is your chance to be like Jesus. After all, your son *chose* her to

be his wife. This you must respect." She will make it all right, for she loves Jesus, once she adjusts herself to a black grandchild. Ah, how prejudice has blinded us, victimizing even those of us who think we are free of it.

If I truly reverence a man, I do so because he is a person for whom Christ died. Color is beside the point, and it must remain beside the point at every level of human experience. The important thing about every man is that he is made in God's image. This is the basis of reverence for human personality, that it is the creation of divine personality and has the mark of divinity upon it. This is the key that unlocks the box to all other values that we should respect. Property is to be respected since it is the fruit of man's labor and the means of his livelihood and happiness. Education, freedom, money, civil rights, occupation, a man's home, a man's privacy, books, and time are all to be reverenced because they have to do with the dignity of manhood.

In living in a black world as I have the past three years as a professor in a Negro college, I have been impressed with the way the black person responds to being accepted in those little, less important ways. It is one thing to let his kids go to school with yours and to allow him to wait on you at Sears, but it is something else to accept him as a person in all those little ways that make life sweet. I enjoy complimenting black parents (white ones too of course) on the beauty and good behavior of their children, which I do sometimes in public places to total strangers. What a response I get, saying something nice about their children as they patiently await their food in a restaurant!

I notice that my colleagues at Bishop College respond to being confided in. Here is the real person-to-person relationship, when the weals and woes of life are shared together. You are at one with a black man when you can gossip in such a way, about both blacks and whites, that it is obvious that there are no racial overtones. I noticed this recently when a black teacher was complaining to me about another black teacher, really giving him hell about something. This was a man-to-man encounter in which there was no awareness of race. One man was mad at another man and he was telling a third man about it. Our laughter and tears together will transcend all differences in color once God has his way with us.

And I have learned the power of "the minor morals" in a black world, those courtesies that speak volumes --- *thank you, please,* and *good morning, professor.* And I have learned to say *Sir* and *Mister* so that it sounds the same way to blacks as to whites. I have a brother in the flesh, a business man, who has not reached the place where he can say "Yes, sir" to a Negro or even to address him as *Mister.* He tries to be courteous, but manages to avoid these terms that suggest an acceptance he is not yet ready for. I understand, bless his heart, for I know his background. But this should be no surprise to those who live far beyond the southland when the *Gospel Guardian,* from deep in the heart of Texas, runs an article by a prominent minister who admits to believing in white supremacy and insists that the Negro

is inferior to him socially, even conceding that he is a racist. I appreciate the honesty but I am appalled by the irreverence, especially when he suggests that this is a Christian view.

If this minister could have some of my recent experiences at Bishop College, he would see things differently. I am not referring simply to the intellectual grace which I have witnessed in many Negroes, which the brother seems to be unaware of, but to the tender stories of person-to-person contact that can be just as real between blacks and whites as anyone else. There is one incident especially that I wish to share with you, for I shall always remember it as one of the sweetest things that ever happened to me anywhere.

It has to do with the fact that due to the financial plight of the college some of us newer professors, including many whites, may have to be dropped from the faculty. When the word got around that I would probably have to leave in order to make room for the black professors who have been on the faculty longer than I, a black professor, and a woman at that, offered to surrender her seniority and resign if it would mean that I could be kept on the faculty. “I believe his contribution to the college is so great that I want to do this,” she explained. You can imagine how such graciousness touched my old heart. It wasn’t that she supposed I would be unable to find work elsewhere, but she wanted me to stay at her own black college, and she was willing to give up her position to make it possible. I told my dear Ouida that in all my years of teaching that is surely the sweetest and tenderest thing that has ever happened to me, and it comes from a black woman. Colleges do not do business that way, of course, and I wouldn’t hear to it if they did, but the incident certainly says something about the meaning of black and white together. And it speaks to what I mean by the spirit of reverence.

I like to tell my children about the incident in *Friendly Persuasion* where the Quaker father of a family threatened by an invasion of Rebel forces from the south finally decides that, despite his pacifism, he will take gun in hand and fight. As he mounts his horse, ready to take off for the war, his young son says to him, “Daddy, shoot me a Rebel.” The father dismounts, draws his son close to him and says tenderly, “Son, don’t ever speak of a man that way.” It is the lesson I want my sons to learn: to treat every person with reverence, including the way they are referred to when they are absent.

A recent visitor in our home was talking about disposing of some of his property. “If nobody wants to buy it, I suppose I can give it to some Nigger,” he said. No doubt he considered himself charitable in the matter, but had my children heard it, I could well have said, as did the Quaker, “Son, don’t ever speak of a man like that.” It is to treat a man as something less than one for whom Christ died.

Goethe saw reverence as the heart and soul of the Christian religion, and we need to examine our ways to see if much of what we do is not a denial of this great principle. If we allow “the system” to stifle individuality and discourage personal growth, we behave irreverently. When we sacrifice truth for party loyalty and freedom for brotherhood

acceptance, we show disrespect for our greatest heritage. Esau is not the only one in history guilty of selling his blessing for a mess of pottage. Heb. 12:15 describes Esau's act as "forfeiting the grace of God," which is another good definition of irreverence. Many a congregation of our people lose sight of its mission as a witnessing, redeeming, confessing community and concerns itself far too much with its own image and its own comforts. We often leave adequate buildings in communities where we ought to be in order to build something more pretentious. We have learned from our religious neighbors to think big and build big, and like our neighbors we spend most of what we have on ourselves. It may well. be Esau's kind of irreverence.

Lest we forget that Isaiah's cry to Israel about their irreverence can apply to us as well in these prosperous and perilous times:

"I was there to be sought by a people who did not ask, to be found by men who did not seek me. I said, 'Here am I, here am I', to a nation that did not invoke me by name.

I spread out my hands all day appealing to an unruly people who went their evil way, following their own devices." (Isa. 65) — *the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

"DOCTRINE DIVIDES, SERVICE UNITES"

Every worthwhile endeavor, whether political, social or religious, eventually cultivates its cliches. Our own unity efforts, as well as the ecumenical movement at large, is no exception. This is to be expected, for cliches are depositories of at least some truth, and they serve to say much in few words. The problem is that they are often overstatements or oversimplifications, and may therefore be misleading.

This is the case with "Doctrine divides, service unites," which is increasingly urged upon us as a principle of unity. It asserts that Christians who have long been hopelessly divided over doctrine can find oneness by joining hands in service to suffering humanity. Unquestionably there is important truth here, and it is often demonstrated in emergency situations, where folk have no time to consider doctrinal differences, so busy are they in mutual service. Yet even here it is proper to ask if this is the essence of Christian unity.

So we are challenging the value of the statement, suggesting that it may be misleading. It not only leaves the wrong impression in reference to the relationship between doctrine and unity by implying that doctrine is unimportant, but it misses the point of what really divides and unites us.

There is nothing divisive *per se* about doctrine, unless indeed the reference is to the doctrines of men, which often support sectarianism. But even here no man's interpretation of scripture, which is all a doctrine of man is, is in itself divisive. It is the behavioral

problem that goes along with it that is factious. That is, when a man is bent upon forming a clique or party around his hobby. This is the Lord's complaint in Mt. 15:9 ("Their worship of me is in vain, for they teach as doctrines the commandments of men") where man is making his own opinion the commandment of God.

The truth about doctrine is that it strengthens the bond of union between disciples. It is in doctrine that we are nourished of God and led by his Spirit. As I Pet. 2:2 has it: "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that you may grow thereby." The milk of the word certainly does not divide us. It is rather the bad attitude of a factious spirit that separates us into warring parties.

There is no place in scripture where doctrine (teaching) is in itself the cause of division; that is, where ideas are sincerely set forth as an honest effort to understand God's will. Divisions come only when men press their opinions to the place of either having their way or tearing things up, which is what we mean by a behavioral problem. This is why we contend that the line of fellowship cannot be drawn on a brother only because he is mistaken, *sincerely* mistaken, in his teaching of the Bible. On the other hand a brother may make fellowship impossible by his irresponsible, sectarian behavior even when he is doctrinally *right.*

This is evident in the case of Hymenaeus and Philetus in II Tim. 2, who are often referred to as heretical because of what they *taught.* That they were wrong, and seriously wrong, about their idea of the resurrection, is evident enough, for the record says: "They have shot wide of the truth in saying that our resurrection has already taken place." But this is not a case of folk who mean well but are only mistaken in their efforts to understand. It is primarily a problem of attitude and behavior. Verse 16 refers to their "empty and worldly chatter," and in I Tim. 1:20, where Hymenaeus is referred to again, it is clear that it is a case of bad conscience. Men do not make "shipwreck of their faith" simply by being sincerely mistaken, but by "spurning conscience." Such were Hymenaeus and Philetus. The record says they blasphemed. They deceitfully endeavored to lead disciples astray by their empty talk that spread like gangrene. While their doctrine of the resurrection, which was really a denial of the gospel, was as erroneous as it could be, the real problem lay in the kind of men they were, their character, attitude and behavior. Never would the apostle have "consigned to Satan" a sincere truth-seeker, however mistaken he may have been, as he did Hymenaeus.

This case makes it clear what divides men --- a *lack of love*, with all that that means: envy, strife, pride, insincerity. So long as a man loves his brothers and remains teachable, he is not going to be factious, even when his mistaken views are rather serious. This is why forbearance is listed among the virtues: there would be little need for such a grace if it were not that some of us are going to be wrong along the way. But when a brother becomes intractable, and is so set in his way (whether right or wrong *doctrinally)* that he'll

rule or ruin, the grace of forbearance is in vain. This calls for stronger measures, such as consigning one to Satan, as Paul did to Hymenaeus.

Surely we can see that a brother who believes that liberty in Christ allows him to use instrumental music or one who interprets prophecy in a way to allow for a premillennial reign of Jesus is not to be put in the same class with Hymenaeus and Philetus. It is of course possible for one to *behave* himself in such a way about these things as to make himself a problem, but when that is the case it is his behavior and attitude and not his view-point that makes him like Hymenaeus. One can be an Hymenaeus and be anti-organ or anti-premillennial as well.

So the sweeping generalization that "Doctrine divides" or even tends to divide will not hold up. To the contrary it is the teaching (didache) of the apostles that enriches and strengthens the bond of union which we have in Christ. Take this instruction for instance: "Be generous to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another as God in Christ forgave you" (Eph. 4:32). Or this one: "Put on the garments that suit God's chosen people, his own, his beloved: compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, patience. Be forbearing with one another, and forgiving, where any of you has cause for complaint: you must forgive as the Lord forgave you" (Col. 3:12-13). Here is instruction on how to take care of difficult people and how to handle delicate problems. How vital to the preservation of unity!

It is probable that when folk say that "Doctrine divides" they are referring to all those speculations about scripture that often engross our brothers. Many have hobbies that are easy to ride. Others get lopsided in their concerns, making too much of what may well be appropriate in moderation. Some can talk or write only about the war question, divorce and remarriage, or the order of worship. Even these things do not divide within themselves, and it is in such areas where the rest of us are to extend forbearance and love, showing warmth also toward those who have some hangup on a private interpretation. So long as he too remains loving and tractable, not allowing himself to demand that others accept his viewpoint, unity will be preserved.

As for the other end of the slogan, "Service unites," we can only conclude that it too is partly right and partly wrong. The basis of unity is not service. Many a folk work side by side all week or all year, and do a good job together, who have no common bond whatever, except that they are employed by the same company. Many a congregation has an impressive service record, wherein many brothers are at work together, that is not necessarily united in heart and mind. Yet it is true that people who have difficulty find that their differences melt into insignificance when they get involved in doing something for Jesus together. Service, like doctrine, while it is not the ground of fellowship, deepens and strengthens it. Nearly always there is more peace and happiness in a congregation that is

busy doing something for suffering humanity, which must be distinguished from doing something for itself.

The basis of unity and fellowship is Jesus. It is the magnetic power of his love that makes us one. Like the filings adhering to the magnet, the closer we are to him the more secure is our position. In playing with a magnet and nails, one notices that the nails that hang to other nails tend to slip loose and fall, while those next to the magnet are sure and steadfast. Too often we depend on some leader or group or congregation, which is risky, however close *they* may be to Jesus. Our closeness to each other should be because we are together drawn to him, not because we are drawn to each other. “If I be lifted up,” he promised, “I will draw all men to myself.” That is where we want to be, for he is the anchor of our soul and the firm foundation of our life. In Jesus service becomes meaningful and doctrine becomes enriching. --- *the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

EDUCATION AND BIGOTRY AT HARDING COLLEGE

NORMAN L. PARKS

Though the right-wing paranoia of Harding College’s “National Education Program” is too widely advertised to invite further analysis, the folly of trying to yoke education with bigotry is freshly re-exhibited with almost every new issue of the program’s “National Letter.” A recent one passing judgment on the Kent State affair shows a startling disregard for a basic legal standard as old as Blackstone, as well as a remarkable indifference to the political setting of an issue on which it presumed to shed light. Perhaps a note of compassion over so sad a tragedy in a judgmental article is not to be expected, but its absence will escape few thoughtful readers.

The article condemning students and Kent State administrators for the killing of four young people, the wounding of nine others, and the injury to one National Guard member which required medical attention was based entirely on the banned Portege County grand jury report. The author, George Benson, dismissed as lacking in thoroughness the findings of the President’s Commission, the Justice Department, and, remarkably, the FBI, all of which reached conclusions in conflict with the grand jury report.

The purpose of the grand jury in English and American law is to return presentments against particular individuals when the evidence indicates that there are grounds for guilt. It meets in secret, it hears testimony in secret, and it submits its findings to the court to which it is responsible. The publication of a special report by this jury amounted to conviction, not accusation, violated its oath of secrecy standards since the thirteenth century, endangered the selection of an impartial trial jury, threatened “irreparable

damage" to the 25 accused persons, leveled unsupported charges "bordering on criminal accusation" against 23 faculty members, and otherwise exceeded its powers, according to Federal Judge William K. Thomas, who ordered the jury report struck from the record.

The utilization of this report by a Christian College discloses a shocking insensitivity to the basic principles of due process, principles belonging to that galaxy of propositions patriots like to call *Americanism.* The article convicts before a court of law has spoken. It condemns the students and faculty, but finds no flaw in the behavior of the grand jury. Calm objectivity is made to yield its paramountcy to passionate attachment to ideology.

Also missing from the article was any hint that the report could have had significant political motivation. The grand jury was called at the instance of Gov. Rhodes, who had ordered the National Guard to the Kent State campus. His administration was in growing trouble. Every public school in the state had closed early because the funds which would have kept them operating for the full term had been diverted under the leadership of Rhodes to support parochial schools (which flourishingly finished their full session), and there were thousands of angry parents and teachers. Moreover, his administration was struggling against mounting charges of fiscal mismanagement and corruption. He badly needed a whitewash in the Kent State affair. His administration provided the "investigative staffs" for the grand jury, as described in the Harding article. The timing of the release of the grand jury report just three weeks before the Rhodes administration had to go before the electorate *in* November is worth noting.

The Harding article sub-headlines the cry "Kill, Kill" which the students were said to have raised in attacking the National Guard. Perhaps it is worth asking, who taught the students this language? One wonders if the author ever attended a ROTC session and heard a middle-aged officer bellow "Kill! Kill! Kill!" at a bunch of callow freshman cadets. Truly, the Establishment must learn to read its own acts, and look to its own geese.

What kind of "national education" is such an article promoting? Is the lesson this, that justice appeals to passion rather than compassion, speaks before it hears, convicts when it accuses, condemns before it tries, and absolves tainted means for posited ends?

The Kent State story is one which should bring tears of sorrow to the eyes of a Christian, an infinite sadness over so unnecessary a tragedy. There should be deep regret over the snuffing out of the life of an innocent girl on the way to classes and of an uninvolved boy who deprecated violence. Faced with such an incident, all of us stand to be benefitted by the Puritan reminder that "A is for Adam, who sinned all."

An article marked more by compassion and less by judgment *would* be more in keeping with the professed aims of an institution which calls itself Christian. Certainly no secular judge should exceed a religious educator in his concern over the rights of the

accused or the protection of the un-accused from criminal smear. Such an approach might bring in fewer corporate dollars, but there are other returns for bread cast upon the waters. — *Norman L. Parks is a professor at Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro.*

"Not yet, 0 Freedom! close thy lids in slumber,

For thy enemy never sleeps."

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

READERS' EXCHANGE

ATLANTA UNITY MEETING

The program for the Sixth Annual Unity Forum, to be conducted July 1-3 at Atlanta Christian College in Atlanta, Georgia, has been announced by J. Paul Du Bois, minister of the Brookvalley Church of Christ in Atlanta, who is chairman of the forum committee.

David Eubanks, president of Johnson Bible College, will give the key-note address Thursday evening on "The Unity of the Spirit," which is the theme of the forum. The same evening Charles Holt of Chattanooga speaks on "The Basis of Unity."

Ervin Waters of Fresno, California will address the forum on "The Odyssey of Division," and Floyd rose of Toledo, Ohio will speak on "The Hope of Unity Between Black and White," both on Friday morning.

The Friday afternoon session will feature Thomas Olbricht of Abilene Christian College, speaking on "A Look at Romans 14," and Ervin Waters on "The Twisted Scriptures."The Friday evening program has Carl Ketcherside, editor of *Mission Messenger,* speaking on "The Only Creed for Unity," and Orval Morgan, professor at Atlanta Christian College, presenting "Love As Fruit of the Spirit."

The unity forum will be concluded on Saturday morning with Dwain Evans of West Islip, New York speaking on "The Holy Spirit and Unity," and Andrew Hairston, minister of the Simpson St. Church of Christ in Atlanta, on "The Meaning of Fellowship and Unity in the Spirit."

Also on Saturday morning will be a sharing session led by Dale Crain, who will report on his communication efforts in interracial seminars, relating this to religious division, which may be seen as a communication problem.

"Examples from the History of Our Pioneers on How to Get Along with Each Other" will be given by Leroy Garrett, editor of *Restoration Review,* at a dinner meeting scheduled for Friday evening. Other features will include prayers for unity and sharing sessions.

Atlanta Christian College is making dormitory space available free of charge for those who attend. For reservations and for further information write J. Paul Du Bois, Brookvalley Church of Christ, 1146 Sheridan Rd., N. E. Atlanta 30324.

ON BEING LOUSY

We did not subscribe to your lousy booklet, neither do we want it to come to our home. Take our name off your mailing list or we will have a lawyer do it for us. --- *California*

My dear sister in the Lord:

There is no problem at all in removing your name from our list of subscribers. We do so at the slightest and most gentle hint, for there is no need sending the paper to anyone who does not care for it. Nor would we wish to offend a friend in Jesus in any such way. You certainly will not need the services of a lawyer. Even if we for some reason delayed in responding to your request, you would only need to mark your copy *Refused* and turn it back to your mailman. He would return it to us and we'd have to pay him a dime for it! That's cheaper than lawyers these days.

Since you did not subscribe yourself, someone sent in the money for you. We ask our friends to send only the names of those who are open to new ideas and willing to examine new approaches. It is a compliment to you that someone would have thought of you in this light.

I thank you for your criticism. Sometimes when I mail the booklet I too think it is "lousy," but I cannot always help that due to my limitations. But it is a sincere effort to do something about our terribly divided brotherhood and to encourage more openness and freedom. If you would care to be more specific and name the areas in which we are coming up short, I would be more than grateful and would consider your suggestions carefully. Actually we do not get enough critical letters such as you were kind enough to send. But the more pointed you can be in your criticism the more help you will be to us.

Even though you will not be around to read us anymore, be assured of my love and appreciation for you. I would appreciate your prayers in my behalf, that the Lord will ever direct me into more responsible journalism.

Sincerely in our Lord,

Leroy Garrett

UNITY FACTION

I understand that there is to be a Unity Forum or such like in Atlanta, Georgia the first weekend in July. This interests me for several reasons. I am interested in following you people in the "Unity faction" of the "Restoration movement." --- *Indiana*

This comes from one of our preachers in the so-called "anti-Herald of Truth" wing of the brotherhood, a group of brethren I deeply love and am always eager to hear from. But I take exceptions to his reference to our work in behalf of the unity of the Spirit as a *faction.* We have enough factions already, and none of us should be interested in adding another. If we cannot wage peace instead of war and remove the walls of separation instead of keeping them in constant repair, without creating still another division, I want to know why.

Does not recent history prove that the brother is both wrong and unfair in making such a charge? For more than a decade now our unity efforts have been pressed. Are there any unity cliques? Are there any congregations divided over our unity plea? Are there any unity leaders who endeavor to build a parry around themselves and thus have their own "loyal church"? Is there any plea that those who believe in unity should "Come out from among them" and form themselves into faithful "unity churches"?

To the contrary we have all gone out of our way to see to it that no such impressions are left. All these years we have urged those concerned for unity and fellowship to remain in their congregations and to work for more peace and understanding in a loving and non-divisive way. We ourselves move among all our various groups or factions, honoring *all* of them as our brothers. We make nothing a test of fellowship that God has not made a condition for being saved, not even the matter of fellowship itself. Brethren can disagree with us, oppose us, and even reject us, but still we love them and accept them as God's children. We refuse to be brought into anyone of our factions as much as we refuse to start another faction, in which we would draw the line against all who did not go along with us.

In the light of these facts pray tell me how we could possibly fairly and properly be called a "unity faction?"

LIFE OF TRUST

In our February issue we published a piece entitled "An Open Letter to a Rejected Minister," in which we told of the young Church of Christ minister, who is dedicated to a work among youthful addicts but who was rejected by his elders because he would not openly repudiate Pat Boone. In my letter to him I assured him that "There is absolutely no question but what the Lord will bless you and lead you in the way that shines brighter than you could ever imagine. To trust in him is your victory. He has never let anybody down

yet, and he will bear you up, believe me, as if on eagles' wings. You need not fear what any man or party can do."

The Lord has vindicated me in encouraging our young brother in this way, as the following excerpt from a recent letter of his will indicate. You understand that he conducts a halfway home for youth in trouble, especially those whose lives are troubled by dope. He is telling about life at this place he calls *His House.*

> Nearly everyday 4 to 20 young hippie type youth have come wanting to know what is going on, and asking who the "He" is of *His House.* They are also asking about what we mean by the "Jesus trip." Today there are four people here painting one of the rooms. One is a girl who was a stripper at a Ft. Worth nightclub. She is now off drugs. My wife prayed in tears with her that her husband could somehow get out of jail soon so that she could teach him Jesus. Today we found out that her husband's prison term has been reduced. Praise the Lord!
>
> The other day we needed paint for the house. I only had 6.00. In a state of frustration I went into a paint store and told the man: "I'm a minister of the Church of Christ working with *His House* and we need some paint." On the way to the store I had prayed: "Oh God, if you can multiply loaves and fishes, please multiply my 6.00, because we need paint." The man replied: "What color do you want. I'll just donate *it* to you." He was an absolute stranger!
>
> Later on we needed a plumber for the house. We prayed, and the next day *two* plumbers just happened to drop by and offer their services. What can we say except *Praise the Lord!* Today we got a phone bill of 12.00, which we could not pay. A man walked in off the street and handed me 30.00. He said he was from the Baptist Church. My mouth is still open!

This reads like a page from Dave Wilkerson's *The Cross and the Switchblade,* and it demonstrates once more what can happen to one who really trusts God to meet his needs. Oh, how lacking we are in this kind of religion. All these years our people have relied too much on their own resources. God does not do great things through us and for us because we neither expect it nor need it.

It is all right now that I give you this man's name and address, and it may be that some of our readers would choose to help in his ministry. Ouida and I have resolved to help the work along. We do believe he is deserving, and we have advised him to keep a scrupulous account of all monies received and to acknowledge any and all gifts. Thus far that has not taken much of his time! You may write him if you desire and have him tell you more about his work: Ben B. Boothe, His House, 1424 6th Ave., Ft. Worth Tex. 76104.

(As this goes to press we have word that his house has burned and so the work is relocating. You should for the time being write to Ben in care of *Restoration Review*.)

MINI-MEETINGS

Recently I have visited Miami and Tulsa, Oklahoma, Phoenix, and Washington, D.C. The Washington trip was also for professional reasons, for I was being interviewed for a government position. But we have decided not to take a government job unless we can be assigned to the regional office in Dallas. My 16 year old Phoebe has issued an ultimation that she wants to graduate from Denton High School, and that's that.

While in Washington I joined Lee Keesling in a house meeting made up mostly of disenchanted Episcopalians, disenchanted with Episcopalianism that is they were the happiest, noisiest ("Praise God"), most spiritual Episcopalians I've ever met. Lee also works for God at his government post, concerned as he is with the cure and prevention of drug addiction. I met interesting, God-conscious people at his office, some of whom were themselves snatched from the hell of addiction. One lady on Lee's staff runs a halfway house for girls who get caught up in the habit. She boards them, provides motherly care, and even finds jobs for them. So at least some "federal bureaucrats" are doing more than shuffling papers.

In Miami I was the guest of Bob and Betty White, friends of many years. Besides private sessions we had two public services at the Church of Christ where Bob labors. A number came from a distance, and the response to my messages, one being on unity and one on the spiritual life, was positive.

Meetings in Tulsa, in the home of John and Glenna Forbes, brought together some of the most spiritual Church of Christ folk I have met anywhere. We also had a gathering in the community room of a local bank. In Phoenix I was the guest of Sam Meyers, editor of *Concerned Christian,* who arranged a meeting in a downtown hotel. I enjoyed numerous personal contacts, especially an extended conversation with Dudley Lynch and his family. Dudley, formerly with the *Christian Chronicle* and Campus Evangelism, is now a feature editor of a Phoenix newspaper. We are urging Dudley to continue using his talents among Churches of Christ, despite discouraging experiences. He is convinced that our people are greatly influenced by right-wing political philosophy, even more than by the Bible.

Future trips will include Kansas City, Corpus Christi, and Lewisville, Ohio.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

BOOK NOTES

There is always interest in a commentary of the entire Bible in a single volume. We commend to you *The New Bible Commentary,* edited by Francis Davidson. It is new, up-to-date, with splendid introductions to all the books and verse by verse or section by section study of all of scripture. It is 1200 pages thick, handsomely bound, and sells for 12.95, which is a fair price. But we have a few that we are selling at 10.95 and you can pay for it in two installments, *if* you wish. If you send full amount with your order, we pay the postage.

We remind you again that we have the complete *New English Bible* for 8.95. You should by all means have this exciting translation at hand.

We have both of Louis Cochran's historical novels on the pioneers. *The Fool of God,* story of Alexander Campbell, is going out of print if it is not already. But we have it in paperback for only 1.95. It will be higher later. *Raccoon John Smith,* also out of print, is available in hardback edition at 3.00, but only from us due to a special purchase we made.

We recently told you of the new book, *Thoughts on Unity,* edited by Stan Paregien, which is a compilation of some of the best writing among our folk on the subject of unity. It contains 19 articles, along with pictures, from representatives of all wings of the Restoration Movement. It is one of those books that will be gone after awhile and greatly prized by collectors someday. The price is 5.95, which is a correction of the previous announcement.

Those interested in missions will want to know about a new book, *To Apply the Gospel,* which is a selection of writings of Henry Venn, longtime associated with missionary societies in Britain. Venn's influence was exerted throughout the British empire, especially in West Africa, and his work is a study of how gospel effort touches political policy. Our people are too uninformed about such matters, so you would do well to know about Henry Venn and his labors. 6.95.

In the same general field is *Man, Milieu and Mission in Argentina,* written by a Baptist missionary in that country. Developing the thesis that churches must be planted within the culture where the gospel is preached, the author tells of the mission efforts in Argentina of some ten different denominations, including Disciples of Christ, to whom he gives a low grade. It is interesting and informative. 3.95 in paperback.

For only 2.95 we will send you a 366-page paperback on what might be called "the best of Martin Lloyd-Jones," a British physician turned theologian. The real title is *A First Book of Daily Readings,* and it presents Lloyd-Jones in what he is best at: pithy, edifying remarks that can't help but make you a better person.

By the time you receive this issue *The New Humanity* will be ready for mailing. If you have ordered a copy, you should receive it no later than sometime in June. This is the bound volume of *Restoration Review* for 1970, handsomely bound to match the previous four volumes, with introduction, table of contents, and dust jacket. The price is but 3.00, a

bargain these days. We have extra copies for those who have not already requested it, though the supply is limited. Indeed all five bound volumes are still available, so for 15.00 you can have bound library editions of this journal from 1966 to 1970.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.*